

1 Proceedings
2 disaster just from the suffering that
3 I've gone through. And my first
4 semester was awful because I lost sight
5 in one of my eyes and had to rely on
6 audio instead of visual when I am a
7 visual learner.

8 So this is important because I am
9 not in the running for best student or
10 top of my class. And even before that,
11 as I explained, that while I was
12 incredibly motivated and driven to
13 perform extraordinarily well in school,
14 for the most part, health issues took
15 that out of my control and I learned
16 that perfectionism and performance
17 didn't matter more than relationships
18 and connections.

19 I have had to learn in my life
20 that circumstances require humility and
21 grace, which means that if I truly felt
22 that I could not complete the paper on
23 my own, I wouldn't have hesitated to
24 convey this to the administration. I
25 have no pride, in this way, holding me

1 Proceedings
2 back or keeping me from seeking help.
3 While I don't have pride that keeps me
4 from admitting mistakes or prevents me
5 from admitting when I simply can't do
6 something, I do have the desire to
7 please.

8 And even though I can no longer
9 compete -- compete for the best of the
10 greater, I can at least be true and
11 honest. Beyond people thinking ill of
12 me or questioning my integrity, being my
13 second-to-worst fear, my worst fear is
14 not being able to correct people's
15 opinions of me and losing their respect.
16 As soon as the suspicion formed in
17 Professor Gould's head, I received one
18 of the worst punishments, the loss of
19 his respect that would go along with
20 losing his offer to sponsor me for an
21 independent study.

22 Because I explained how
23 researching the Right to Try legislation
24 for my presentation solidified the need
25 for me to write a research paper on this

1 Proceedings
2 topic, in his kindness and generosity,
3 he gave me the offer that would give me
4 credit for such an endeavor.

5 I have rarely, if ever, been
6 extended such kindness. The idea that I
7 would elect to even risk this gift is
8 incomprehensible to me. And my heart
9 truly breaks knowing that I have somehow
10 failed to avoid suspicion or document my
11 entire research process so that I could
12 have overwhelming evidence to support my
13 innocence before needing to come to,
14 obviously, this hearing.

15 So just a quick summary of the
16 main points is that the first half of my
17 paper was directly, like, what we went
18 over class curriculum. My analysis with
19 them wasn't anything particularly unique
20 and, yeah, they hadn't challenged my use
21 of my own work in my paper, like my
22 previous work in my paper so I don't
23 believe that needs to be addressed.

24 Again, the topic wasn't dictated
25 by what I found. Like, I didn't find

1 Proceedings
2 the article and dictate the topic. I
3 actually changed my outline based on
4 Professor Gould's responses to the ideas
5 I had come up with and that was really
6 what he really enjoyed. And I never
7 read through the resource, but it was
8 included at the bottom of my outline
9 from the beginning, so it was very out
10 there for anyone to see.

11 And the only thing that I actually
12 used it for was, most likely, sources in
13 the end, although these were the same
14 sources that were cited in a bunch of
15 other papers as well regarding the
16 topic. So I can't necessarily say that
17 they were just exactly from this one,
18 but I think that I initially had taken
19 the sources, copied them to look through
20 them. And I tend to -- as I'm going
21 through other secondary sources, I tend
22 to do little tallies to see how many
23 seconds -- to -- secondary sources find
24 that these same cases were valuable.

25 So in this, I'm not looking at the

Page 126

Page 127

1 Proceedings
2 analyses offered by each of these, but
3 I'm literally just tallying up, like,
4 which cases have really valuable
5 significant information, just to
6 prioritize them in my reading to include
7 them into my case. And as you go
8 through the different cases, we can look
9 at most of what is highlighted as, like,
10 paraphrasing or similar, between us, are
11 quotes from cases.

12 And if you look at most of the
13 cases that I have here, either the area
14 that applies to, like, trade secrets or
15 is at all related is very short or the
16 actual entire case is very short. And
17 so the quotes or the actual, you know,
18 specific things that are mentioned by
19 the court that are rapidly used are the
20 same for many papers, if that makes
21 it -- that's why we have Headnotes and
22 such on LexusNexus is really based on
23 the specific idea.

24 So as I said, I'm very happy to go
25 through each and every individual thing,

1 Proceedings
2 which I was willing to do beforehand,
3 but I could not because I was given the
4 time limit of, Hey, you have to tell me
5 by today at 5:00 whether you want a
6 hearing or not. So I couldn't actually
7 take the time to go through -- which is
8 what I wanted -- to go through and
9 literally take each and every
10 highlighted area and show you and add
11 cases or papers or articles on it that
12 literally say the exact same thing.

13 Like, the generalizations -- like
14 he said that after he read the first --
15 after he read the first sentence, I
16 think, or, like, the very beginning of
17 my paper, that's when he was initiated
18 to see if this was an idea that was
19 written about before. And I find it
20 very unfortunate -- fortunate that he
21 was intrigued enough to go and look at
22 it and see if anybody else had come up
23 with that strategy.

24 But I find it very unfortunate
25 that he only stopped at one because if

Page 128

Page 129

1 Proceedings
2 he had put that in the search bar, then
3 he quickly could have clicked through a
4 multitude of other cases that would
5 say -- would sort of have the same
6 thing, which is really surprising.
7 And just as an example, I quickly
8 did -- I did a quick search based on
9 what he had said and I came up with
10 another arti- -- I guess I can use this,
11 if it's quick. So just in response to
12 right here and right now, just based on
13 what he said --

14 PROFESSOR RIESMEYER: Would you
15 like them to put it up --

16 MS. TSHUDY: Oh, yeah, just so
17 it's easy for them to see.

18 Now, I took this and put it in my
19 Adobe just based on -- I don't know if
20 you heard him discussing the idea that
21 really intrigued him that he found was
22 super original or thought, which was
23 this data exclusivity grants. And so if
24 you just get an idea, if you look at
25 this --

1 Proceedings
2 DEAN WILLIAMS: Trisha, you might
3 want to make that full size. Let's make
4 it full screen.

5 MS. TSHUDY: Okay.

6 DEAN WILLIAMS: Is that a little
7 better for you?

8 MS. TSHUDY: Yes. He was sort of
9 grasping the idea that, I guess, I must
10 have searched this not necessarily on
11 where he said the mentioning of the very
12 first lines, but I can search that as
13 well if you'd like me to. I didn't
14 think that that was even more important.
15 But I think this kind of gives an idea
16 of how this is not an unusual or
17 unwritten about topic.

18 So he actually kind of had the
19 indicator that I sort of took all these
20 articles that I read and instead of
21 choosing to write about tests or
22 processes because I think had gone
23 through the idea of dual patenting being
24 denied -- not dual patenting, no. Yeah,
25 dual patenting being denied and trade

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

Page 130

1 Proceedings
2 secrets being an alternative to that. I
3 researched everything in regards to
4 testing or methods or processes or
5 procedures or the ability for them to
6 patent the in-between stuff between
7 products.

8 So my paper was a culmination of
9 all the results of all of those topics.
10 So it was more general than all these
11 specific papers, if that makes sense.
12 There's definitely specific things that
13 had been mentioned that I'd love to
14 address, but I would first like to hear
15 if you guys have any questions, and I
16 really hope you do, because I can
17 explain everything if you give me the
18 chance.

19 Go ahead.

20 [REDACTED]: Okay, so I was an
21 English major in undergrad, so I don't
22 know anything about pharmaceuticals or
23 biotech. Again, I'm sorry if it sounds
24 like I'm asking something silly, but I
25 am familiar with Turnitin. And I am

Page 131

1 Proceedings
2 familiar with papers. I've written a
3 copious amount of papers in both --
4 throughout undergrad and throughout my
5 life.

6 I'm a writer, so I look at this a
7 little bit differently. And something
8 that really caught my eye, that was
9 really unique is in the last page of
10 your paper, under Part 4 in the
11 conclusion, and in page 224 -- 244 of
12 Hannah-Alise Rogers' paper --

13 Dean Williams, would you mind
14 bringing that up?

15 DEAN WILLIAMS: I'd be happy to.
16 I just need to find the right one,
17 and then I need to -- let me switch it
18 over. What would you like? The Law
19 Review?

20 [REDACTED]: The Law Review. Yes.

21 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. The Law
22 Review notes. And what page?

23 [REDACTED]: It's 244.

24 DEAN WILLIAMS: This page right
25 here?

Page 132

1 Proceedings
2 [REDACTED]: Scroll down a little
3 bit. Yes, perfect.
4 So in that last paragraph that
5 starts "Generic manufacturers,"
6 Hannah-Alise Rogers is setting up for a
7 conclusion. And she goes, Generic
8 manufacturers can protect her by
9 equivalency custody created secret law,
10 and so on and so on. And then she goes
11 on and lists it numerically. She says,
12 Second, generic manufacturers can
13 withstand the threat of disclosure. And
14 then, third, generic manufacturers can
15 address a threat arising from common
16 law, so on and so forth.

17 In Ms. Tshudy's conclusion, she
18 says, Information, in light, and then
19 the way that she structures it, from a
20 writer's perspective, it's a little bit
21 awkward because on the last page, it
22 says, out of nowhere, Third, generic
23 manufacturers can address the threat
24 arising from the common law of public
25 access, arguing that the purpose of the

Page 133

1 Proceedings
2 right is for the public to view the
3 court as a legitimate question.

4 So not only is this lifted, it
5 appears verbatim, but it's not the
6 tertiary point that you're making, so I
7 just want to understand, like, why that
8 choice stylistically.

9 MS. TSHUDY: It's not tertiary,
10 like, it's not the third one --

11 [REDACTED]: It's not the third point
12 you're making. You made four points
13 before that, so why does it say that
14 it's the third?

15 MS. TSHUDY: Oh, yeah.

16 [REDACTED]: Because when someone
17 lists their conclusion, it's like,
18 first, second. First, I want to say
19 this. Second, I want to say that.
20 Third, I want to say this, which is what
21 she does, but I don't see how that's the
22 third point.

23 MS. TSHUDY: I mean, I suspect
24 that it was just an editing issue,
25 because this whole time -- like I said,

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

Page 134

Proceedings

I started with my general thing. And if you look at my -- I think it was my original outline or my previous outline that had been the third, but then as I'm going through and adding and subtracting topics -- I mean, that's obviously a mistake, and, again, these are like the small things that I do not -- I am not unwilling to recognize issues, I guess, or mistakes that I made.

And I openly admitted that initially, looking at everything, I really got super concerned that I did something that was plagiarism or such. And then this was just, looking through everything, what I've been able to come up with, knowing that I did not read through her paper or copy stuff over. So I can't say for sure, but I don't know if you experienced that.

But sometimes when I'm trying to balance out what I include, I will add or subtract topics insights and rearrange them, but they're always

Page 135

Proceedings

presented in the same order, if that makes sense. So depending on which, you know, background paper that I could have included in the footnotes, which again, he affirmed that that's an option and stuff, I did not have that much time. They tend to go in the same orders.

It just varies -- it varies which ones are included by each paper, but they're always in the same order. So as I'm going through my paper and deciding, adding or subtracting things, which is again a big part of why, even in my presentation, I didn't harp on the Amstar stuff overly, was part because that wasn't what he specifically asked me to look into.

[REDACTED]: I just want to be concise.

MS. TSHUDY: Oh, sorry. [REDACTED]: Substantively -- and please, Professor Gould, correct me if I'm wrong -- it doesn't look different from what Hannah-Alise Rogers is saying,

Page 136

Proceedings

is it not?

DEAN WILLIAMS: So here's Hannah-Alise Rogers' conclusion. She starts with, Generic manufacturers can protect their bioequivalency tests through trade secret law by overcoming obstacles in three potentially threatening contexts. She says, Disclosure by FOIA of trade secrets, and, Constitute commercially valuable information.

Second, Generic manufacturers can withstand the threat of disclosure to the FDA's own use of the information by again arguing that a bioequivalency test constitutes a trade secret under the specific FDA definition and by showing positive steps taken to treat the information as a secret meeting the second circuit test.

Third, Generic manufacturers can address the threat arising from the common law right of public access by arguing that the purpose of the right is

Page 137

Proceedings

for the public to view the court as a legitimate institution and that this purpose would be defeated if the court disclosed on the manufacturer's extremely valuable information to competitors.

Now let's look at Trisha's. So, the emerging issues include the threat of disclosure from FOIA, was the first thing, that can be prevented by proper compliance with the definition set forth by the statute and agency, the threat of disclosure by the FDA's own use of information by limiting it through the second circuit three mark test, and then this exact same language.

Third, generic manufacturers can address the threat arising from the common law right of public access by arguing that the purpose of the right is for the public to view the court as a legitimate institution and that this purpose would be defeated if the court disclosed a manufacturer's extremely

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

Page 138

1 Proceedings
2 valuable information to competitors.
3 [REDACTED]: So this is a bit jarring
4 to me, not only because it's lifted
5 verbatim, word-for-word, but because
6 there doesn't seem to be any difference
7 between this conclusion and the
8 conclusion that Hannah-Alise Rogers is
9 making. And there are parts of the
10 paper where I can actually hear your
11 voice, like there are errors -- and I'm
12 not saying that to criticize you.
13 That's a good thing. That means that I
14 know that you wrote it.

15 And, like, for instance, on -- I
16 believe, sorry. Let me get this page
17 number right. Let's see, 1st, 2nd --
18 it's the 6th page. It starts, As
19 improper patent writing --

20 DEAN WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, which
21 page?

22 [REDACTED]: Yes, it's right there.

23 PROFESSOR BUTLER: On Trisha's
24 paper.

25 DEAN WILLIAMS: On Trisha's

Page 139

1 Proceedings
2 paper -- where are you looking?
3 [REDACTED]: It's, As in -- the next
4 paragraph. The first sentence. So
5 that's an incomplete sentence.

6 MS. TSHUDY: Yeah. There was
7 supposed to be a comma in there, yeah.

8 [REDACTED]: And then if you scroll
9 further down a little bit more, I think
10 you can see somewhere where it says, The
11 court -- I think you have to scroll down
12 a little bit more. Yes, right there.
13 The court explained that -- the court
14 explained that litigation is more
15 feasible than believed.

16 I think you meant to write
17 "previously believed," but when I'm
18 hearing this paragraph, it looks like
19 you're writing, it looks like your
20 email. But when I'm looking at the
21 parts of the paper that are highlighted,
22 I cease to hear your voice and that's
23 what concerns me. And I just wanted to
24 hear your explanation regarding that.

25 MS. TSHUDY: I mean, the biggest

Page 140

1 Proceedings
2 thing is that whenever it came to things
3 that were, like, introductions or
4 conclusions, those tend to be even more
5 so things that are -- this was a really
6 hard subject to create something
7 completely unique and original about.
8 But this was from the beginning what
9 fascinated me, I guess, and brought this
10 forward.

11 But it's annoying because I made
12 last minute changes, that I should have,
13 but normally my introduction and
14 conclusion should be the most looked at
15 and clear and concise of my entire
16 paper, if that makes sense. So I'm
17 actually disappointed in myself, sort
18 of, that it failed. But, yeah.

19 [REDACTED]: But the language that's
20 lifted verbatim, word-for-word, what is
21 your explanation behind that?
22 Especially like, in the conclusion
23 because that is word-for-word, there's
24 almost no difference.

25 MS. TSHUDY: Literally. I'm going

Page 141

1 Proceedings
2 to try to look this up real quick, but
3 my honest-to-goodness idea is that these
4 aren't that unique of conclusions. I
5 honestly thought that my paper would be
6 considered generic, so it literally is
7 just general -- I have no idea how it
8 would be, like -- any instances that are
9 claimed to be, you know, word-for-word.
10 That is, again, why I was literally
11 talking to Dean Williams and believing,
12 like, I don't even understand how that
13 could ever be possible.

14 And if I made any mistakes
15 thinking that some notation that I had
16 in my -- like, while I was putting this
17 together, would have been from something
18 else. I just don't think that that is
19 really -- obviously, I've never made
20 that mistake before, so I wouldn't
21 expect it, but that would definitely not
22 be intentional in any way.

23 But I also would like to even look
24 at whether these topics are literally
25 just so -- like, for instance, The

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

1 Proceedings
 2 common law right to public access --
 3 like exactly what this one sentence in
 4 particular looks at. There are entire
 5 papers written about that. You know
 6 what I mean?
 7 [REDACTED]: But if there were entire
 8 papers, wouldn't your peers have the
 9 similar conclusion or the similar --
 10 like, if that idea was so widespread and
 11 cornerstone, I feel like it would be
 12 apparent in the work of your peers, but
 13 it is uniquely apparent in your work.
 14 Do you get what I'm saying?
 15 MS. TSHUDY: Yes.
 16 [REDACTED]: The fact that it's
 17 word-for-word, it's very, very jarring.
 18 MS. TSHUDY: Yes. Agreed.
 19 [REDACTED]: I'm familiar with
 20 Turnitin. As English majors, we got to
 21 see our own work in Turnitin. And so
 22 what would happen is, like, universities
 23 typically have a percentage threshold,
 24 and sometimes you can have percentages
 25 come up that are like 60%, 80% and have

1 Proceedings
 2 the paper not be plagiarized, right,
 3 because sometimes Turnitin is not as
 4 conservative or will fail to realize
 5 that you've actually cited your sources.
 6 But to see 59% on an originality
 7 report and then to see the words listed
 8 word-for-word, that is also a very
 9 jarring thing. And I just want to give
 10 you a chance to explain that.
 11 And I'm not saying this to attack
 12 you in any way, shape or form, but I'm
 13 giving you, like, a window into my head
 14 because if I was in your shoes, I would
 15 also want to know what I was thinking.
 16 And this is what concerns me the most,
 17 because I believe you that, maybe, you
 18 didn't have malicious intent when you
 19 were doing this, but you can still
 20 plagiarize without meaning to do it.
 21 DEAN WILLIAMS: May I also just
 22 make one point about the Turnitin? I
 23 excluded all sources when I was doing
 24 this Turnitin comparison. I excluded
 25 all sources except the Law Review note

1 Proceedings
 2 of Hannah-Alise Rogers. And similarly
 3 when I did the comparison -- so this Law
 4 Review note is only compared against
 5 Ms. Tshudy's paper, and Ms. Tshudy's
 6 paper is compared only against the Law
 7 Review note.
 8 I did a full Turnitin and it was,
 9 to your point, [REDACTED], not particularly
 10 helpful. So this is just these two
 11 papers being compared against one
 12 another in Turnitin. There are no other
 13 sources being used.
 14 MS. TSHUDY: My biggest thing to
 15 that was -- sorry, now I'm forgetting
 16 because you kept talking. What was your
 17 response specifically to me explaining
 18 that this is like --
 19 [REDACTED]: How are the words
 20 exactly the same? I just want to know
 21 how words -- your conclusion is exactly
 22 the same.
 23 And the reason I'm looking at the
 24 conclusion, and actually disregarding
 25 the other end of the paper is because

1 Proceedings
 2 that should be your summary. Like, that
 3 should be the meat of your paper. So I
 4 want to know how that is so similar to
 5 Ms. Rogers' paper.
 6 MS. TSHUDY: And I wish I could
 7 tell you exactly. And I suspect that
 8 when it came to things like developing
 9 my introduction and conclusion, then I
 10 don't -- again, the one thing that I'm
 11 willing to admit to regarding the note
 12 is that I would have read just enough to
 13 kind of get a general, you know, idea
 14 from it and then just the research. The
 15 only thing I actually took down was the
 16 resources and stuff.
 17 So I don't know if this has any
 18 tie into not realizing -- but I didn't
 19 copy and paste any of her work other
 20 than copying and pasting it to my
 21 outline for him to review, so I have no
 22 idea how I could have said that. I
 23 think I can find an article -- something
 24 else that has it almost the same --
 25 [REDACTED]: You said that you read

Page 146

1 Proceedings
 2 "enough" of the note. But, like, what
 3 does that mean? How do you, like, go
 4 about looking at your sources?
 5 MS. TSHUDY: Oh, read enough of
 6 the note?
 7 [REDACTED]: Yeah, you said that --
 8 MS. TSHUDY: Yeah, so whenever you
 9 do secondary sources -- like when I do a
 10 secondary source search, obviously
 11 there's just like whichever trigger --
 12 all of the wording and stuff, like all
 13 of the words that I add in my search
 14 bar. But also are they, like,
 15 culminated close enough to each other
 16 that they're at least, like, sort of,
 17 combined -- if that makes sense -- sort
 18 of combined to each other and stuff.
 19 Just to make sure with topics like this,
 20 where there's so many options given
 21 to -- everything to, like, look through
 22 and stuff, I sort of choose sources that
 23 at least --
 24 Well, this source came up in the
 25 very beginning of researching. So two

Page 147

1 Proceedings
 2 sources that sort of come close into
 3 what I might be interested in writing
 4 about or might something that might be
 5 fascinating.
 6 [REDACTED]: Do you read the whole
 7 thing or do you do, like, do you skim
 8 it? Because what I do when I research
 9 is, like, I typically will read the
 10 whole thing when I read a source because
 11 I don't want to make any errors. I want
 12 to parse my sources. So are you reading
 13 the whole thing or are you skimming
 14 into --
 15 MS. TSHUDY: I did not read the
 16 whole thing, and if that really works
 17 better -- like I said, I normally don't
 18 want to read the whole thing because I
 19 don't want to see how they analyze stuff
 20 because I don't want it ever to be
 21 thought of that I copied stuff.
 22 Normally -- that hasn't failed me yet.
 23 But, obviously, if you find it
 24 actually better to do the complete
 25 opposite, then I'm completely open to

Page 148

1 Proceedings
 2 changing my processes to make sure that
 3 this never happens again. This is a
 4 nightmare. But, yeah, if that makes
 5 sense. I purposely don't read it
 6 because I feel like that is more
 7 dangerous to leading to copyright issues
 8 than reading it. But if you are
 9 assuming the opposite, then that's
 10 actually more interesting.
 11 [REDACTED]: Do you have --
 12 MS. TSHUDY: I've never actually
 13 heard that before.
 14 [REDACTED]: I just want to be clear.
 15 Did you come across this actual source
 16 when you were doing your research?
 17 MS. TSHUDY: Did I come across the
 18 note?
 19 [REDACTED]: This paper. This
 20 specific paper?
 21 MS. TSHUDY: Yes. And it was
 22 included on my underside of my outline,
 23 but I came across it, like, literally
 24 within less than an hour, probably
 25 minutes before meeting with him for my

Page 149

1 Proceedings
 2 outline. And in his description, it
 3 said that we can include possible
 4 sources if we wanted to talk about them
 5 being like, a possible inclusion.
 6 [REDACTED]: But if you came across
 7 this paper, then why isn't it in your
 8 end notes or like, in your footnotes?
 9 MS. TSHUDY: Because I couldn't
 10 find -- because I couldn't find anything
 11 that is specifically -- well, so this
 12 might be a mistake or something because
 13 I didn't look in depth. I didn't have
 14 anything that I had read from the paper
 15 and specifically pulled from the paper
 16 to put in my information, if that makes
 17 sense.
 18 Like, all this stuff can be pulled
 19 from different ones, otherwise I would
 20 have happily done it. But again, I
 21 asked him if you could just default
 22 include stuff, you know. And I said, is
 23 it like the sample paper? Because the
 24 sample paper was very specific.
 25 DEAN WILLIAMS: Can I just --

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

Page 150

Page 151

1 Proceedings
 2 MS. TSHUDY: And so that's exactly
 3 what I used.
 4 DEAN WILLIAMS: So here's the
 5 sample paper. Just to put everybody's
 6 mind at ease about what this sample
 7 paper is. This is the sample paper
 8 that --
 9 Is this, Professor Gould, is this
 10 the sample paper that you provided to
 11 your students?
 12 PROFESSOR GOULD: Yeah, it looks
 13 like the one I posted in Canvas at the
 14 beginning of the semester.
 15 DEAN WILLIAMS: So this sample
 16 paper -- Professor Butler, may I ask
 17 Professor Gould some questions about
 18 this sample paper, please?
 19 PROFESSOR BUTLER: Please do.
 20 DEAN WILLIAMS: So, Professor
 21 Gould, this is the sample paper that you
 22 provided to your students -- for what
 23 purpose?
 24 PROFESSOR GOULD: So they can have
 25 just some idea -- at one of these

1 Proceedings
 2 workshops on teaching that we do at
 3 Dickinson Law, when I was just starting
 4 to be an adjunct, it was recommended
 5 that you could post, to the students, a
 6 sample paper. I asked one of the
 7 professors, Lance --
 8 DEAN WILLIAMS: If excuse me,
 9 which professor? Professor Cole.
 10 PROFESSOR GOULD: Professor Cole.
 11 Yeah, actually, you had mentioned I
 12 should -- Professor Cole.
 13 DEAN WILLIAMS: I actually found
 14 that email.
 15 PROFESSOR GOULD: Yeah, I asked
 16 you. You recommended I talk to
 17 Professor Cole and Professor Cole sent
 18 this is one that's used at Dickinson
 19 Law. It's just to provide some sample.
 20 DEAN WILLIAMS: So table of
 21 contents.
 22 PROFESSOR GOULD: Right.
 23 DEAN WILLIAMS: You know, sort of,
 24 what we're doing is indemnification in
 25 advance -- a title, the introduction,

Page 152

Page 153

1 Proceedings
 2 footnotes. And were you specific that
 3 students needed to include footnotes at
 4 the bottom of the page, or were you okay
 5 to have students include their footnotes
 6 at the end?
 7 PROFESSOR GOULD: I was definitely
 8 okay to have them at the end and I made
 9 that clear that they could do either
 10 one.
 11 DEAN WILLIAMS: Trisha, do you
 12 have questions about this sample paper?
 13 MS. TSHUDY: No. And I sent this
 14 specific -- I actually sent this to you.
 15 I don't know if you got it a different
 16 way as well, but I remember I emailed
 17 this directly to you when this first
 18 came up.
 19 DEAN WILLIAMS: So this is -- I
 20 don't believe you did, but that's okay.
 21 This is the sample paper that Professor
 22 Gould provided to the students in
 23 Biotech Pharmacy -- or pharmaceuticals
 24 and the law.
 25 MS. TSHUDY: And so the end --

1 Proceedings
 2 instead of it having like a collection
 3 of resources or anything that could
 4 possibly be connected, it just has what
 5 you can directly, like -- sub-scripters.
 6 Well, I guess it's not, in the end,
 7 because I asked him that as well. He
 8 said he clarified that, that was after I
 9 asked him that question about whether we
 10 had to have it at the bottom of the page
 11 because that created formatting issues.
 12 And he said, no, we could have at
 13 the end and then he clarified it in
 14 class based upon my question. And so it
 15 was just that if there were things that
 16 I had read for background information,
 17 it doesn't leave room for me to just
 18 include those things. And there's like
 19 a lot that I read for background or
 20 general knowledge or just to get an idea
 21 about what to write about that I wasn't
 22 able to include because I couldn't cite
 23 them as a resource to a particular
 24 sentence or a particular aspect or
 25 anything like that.

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

Page 154

Proceedings

There are, you know, papers that I read where I actually read the entire thing and stuff, and I still couldn't cite it, but obviously I didn't take anything from them or anything like that. So that was something I specifically clarified him because my default, especially from Bio-Chem undergrad and stuff, is that you mention things that literally could have influenced your ideas or led to your ideas or anything that you could have drawn upon, intentionally or not, just to make sure that people knew that you were giving them credit for that. And that's never been an issue.

I feel like that citations actually -- it's a relief for students because you get to administer credit to other people for stuff, you know, and it's not like anything that you have to feel like -- you're not trying to dodge and weave between what other people have concluded, if that makes sense.

Page 155

Proceedings

PROFESSOR BUTLER: Trisha, when you write a paper --

MS. TSHUDY: Yes.

PROFESSOR BUTLER: I may be putting too much weight on some of the words that are being used. Do you actually work with a blank screen and type in each word yourself or do you literally cut and paste and copy from other sources?

MS. TSHUDY: I don't copy and -- okay, cases. Cases -- if I'm quoting an exact case, I'll copy and paste from quotations -- from the exact thing.

PROFESSOR BUTLER: Right.

MS. TSHUDY: But then I normally set that right away.

PROFESSOR BUTLER: If it's not a quotation, you don't.

MS. TSHUDY: If it's not a quotation, I don't -- copy and paste?

PROFESSOR BUTLER: You've been shown software which indicates there's verbatim reproduction of a lot of

Page 156

Proceedings

language. Is it just copied by typing individually or was it copy and paste?

MS. TSHUDY: I haven't necessarily looked to check. I would be very astonished if things are verbatim, but it would not be copied and pasted from a separate source. I suspect -- well, literally the only possible explanation is if these things got worked into my outline and somehow got separated from the citation, which is normally immediately afterwards, and I thought that I -- literally that that was just something that I had written, if that makes sense.

Like if it snuck into my outline, which normally doesn't ever happen -- and I'm more than willing to admit that if I was going to make mistakes in any semester ever, it would probably be this one, just because of the tragedy that I went through and everything. But again, there is no way that it would ever come straight from a source or anything.

Page 157

Proceedings

Like the only way that could ever be possible is if I wrote it down, if I had it within an outline or resources or something, and it somehow got misplaced or had some accidental deletion of the citation right next to it, and I literally thought that I would have written it.

That is the only time. Like I would never even risk anything of this sort. And again, it's never happened to me, teachers have never questioned stuff like that. Especially when it's something that -- I have to say, it's even more likely to happen when it's something that is something that I've read in so many papers and looks like my just, kind of, like, summarization of background material. So especially if it's something where it's not, like, obviously from somebody else or anything like that, if that makes sense.

DEAN WILLIAMS: Trisha, I'd like to ask you a question.

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

Page 158

1 Proceedings
 2 MS. TSHUDY: Okay. Go ahead.
 3 DEAN WILLIAMS: I want to look at
 4 page 11 of your paper, which -- I'm
 5 sorry, folks, I'll get to the right
 6 page.
 7 Would you please read -- this is
 8 your paper. Will you please read that
 9 entire paragraph?
 10 MS. TSHUDY: The first factor
 11 considers whether the documents were
 12 judicial documents to which the public
 13 had a right of access. Properly
 14 presented, the manufacturer could
 15 possibly end the inquiry here. The
 16 definition of judicial documents, as
 17 discussed in part 2C, is relevant.
 18 Documents which are submitted to and
 19 accepted by a court of competent
 20 jurisdiction in the course of agitative
 21 proceedings and become documents to
 22 which the presumption of public access
 23 applies. Therefore, the documents with
 24 the relevant trade secret information
 25 must be requested or submitted by the

Page 159

1 Proceedings
 2 court in order for the definition to
 3 apply. The necessity of inclusion is
 4 unlikely unless the lawsuit concerns the
 5 method contained within the trade secret
 6 itself.
 7 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. So in this
 8 you refer to part 2C, can you help me
 9 understand what that references to?
 10 MS. TSHUDY: I think I had that
 11 written as an example. I think that was
 12 sent to me, but then it was -- he sent
 13 that to me over email, and it was
 14 scratched out, so I wasn't able to
 15 actually see what it said.
 16 DEAN WILLIAMS: Well, let's go to
 17 the Law Review article.
 18 MS. TSHUDY: Yeah.
 19 DEAN WILLIAMS: I'd like you to
 20 start reading right here, looking at --
 21 Looking at the first factor. This is
 22 page 236 of the Law Review note. Would
 23 you read that?
 24 MS. TSHUDY: Looking at the first
 25 factor, one of the documents were

Page 160

1 Proceedings
 2 judicial documents to which the public
 3 had a right of access. A manufacturer
 4 could likely (inaudible). The
 5 definition of judicial documents that is
 6 discussed in part 2C is relevant.
 7 Documents which are submitted to and
 8 accepted by a court of competent
 9 jurisdiction in the course of agita- --
 10 sorry -- proceedings and become
 11 documents to which the presumption of
 12 public access apply.
 13 Do you want the whole thing?
 14 DEAN WILLIAMS: Keep going.
 15 MS. TSHUDY: Thus the only way
 16 that the definition would apply is if
 17 the documents with relevant trade secret
 18 information were requested by or
 19 submitted to a court, which is not
 20 like --
 21 DEAN WILLIAMS: Probably likely.
 22 MS. TSHUDY: -- to be necessary
 23 unless the lawsuit concerns the
 24 bioequivalency test method itself.
 25 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. So how come

Page 161

1 Proceedings
 2 this copies exactly that same -- how do
 3 you explain that you refer to part 2C,
 4 that you don't know what that means,
 5 when it's the same in this law review
 6 note?
 7 [REDACTED]: Can I get another
 8 water bottle.
 9 DEAN WILLIAMS: Can you get
 10 another what?
 11 [REDACTED]: Water bottle?
 12 DEAN WILLIAMS: Yes. When we
 13 break after this, I'll get you more too.
 14 I'm going to just move on because
 15 I think the next -- I'd like you to read
 16 this next paragraph right here. Just
 17 read it out loud.
 18 MS. TSHUDY: What, me?
 19 DEAN WILLIAMS: Yes, you. If you
 20 would read this next paragraph out loud.
 21 MS. TSHUDY: In addition, even if
 22 a court does request documents
 23 containing trade secrets, generic
 24 manufacturers could argue against
 25 disclosure based on the theory behind

41 (Pages 158 to 161)

Page 162

1 Proceedings
 2 the common law right itself. For
 3 example, the goal of this doctrine of
 4 the right to public access is to portray
 5 the court as a legitimate and
 6 independent body that can be trusted,
 7 respected -- and respected, then the
 8 disclosure of the document upon which a
 9 manufacturer has built its business
 10 could be harmful to the court's
 11 reputation. Inventors, manufacturers,
 12 and producers of lucrative goods would
 13 hesitate to turn to the court's for a
 14 remedy if the court would simply
 15 disclose the trade secrets to the first
 16 person who asks.

17 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. So that
 18 whole paragraph is not cited at all.
 19 There is nothing in that paragraph that
 20 cites to any other primary source. Do
 21 you agree with me?

22 MS. TSHUDY: Yes.

23 DEAN WILLIAMS: You see no
 24 footnoting?

25 MS. TSHUDY: Yes, I agree.

Page 163

1 Proceedings
 2 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. So now
 3 let's look at your paper. Can you read
 4 this paragraph right here?
 5 MS. TSHUDY: In addition, even if
 6 the court does request documents
 7 containing trade secrets, generic
 8 manufacturers could argue against the
 9 disclosure based on the theory behind
 10 the common law right itself. For
 11 example, if the goal of this doctrine of
 12 the right to public access is to portray
 13 the court as a legitimate and
 14 independent body that can be trusted and
 15 respected, then the disclosure of a
 16 document upon which a manufacturer has
 17 built its business could be harmful to
 18 the court's reputation. Inventors,
 19 manufacturers, and producers of
 20 lucrative goods would hesitate to turn
 21 to the courts for a remedy if the Court
 22 would simply disclose their trade secret
 23 to the first person who asked.

24 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. So you
 25 agreed with me, right --

Page 164

1 Proceedings
 2 MS. TSHUDY: Yes, yep.
 3 DEAN WILLIAMS: -- that this is a
 4 conclusion in the Law Review note,
 5 right? No citations, no primary
 6 sources.
 7 You also agree, you read this, it
 8 is identical to this photograph, and in
 9 no way do you cite to this conclusion in
 10 Ms. Rogers' paper. How is it that if
 11 you never read Ms. Rogers' paper, you
 12 could copy her language word-for-word?
 13 Her conclusion, word-for-word? Her
 14 original work, word-for-word? How could
 15 you do that?

16 MS. TSHUDY: I mean, I read
 17 different parts of it -- and, again, you
 18 brought this up initially and stuff, and
 19 I explained this right afterwards that
 20 this would be the most difficult thing
 21 for me to understand. And that,
 22 honestly, it has to guarantee that I
 23 definitely made a mistake somewhere in
 24 making sure that my citations matched up
 25 with everything. Particularly when it

Page 165

1 Proceedings
 2 comes to the public access, there are so
 3 many papers that were written
 4 specifically about this that I honestly
 5 mistook this, somehow, in my list of --
 6 from my outline, not from her paper --
 7 in my list, from my outline, from my
 8 writing.
 9 So I have no idea how I separated
 10 the citation that I put at the end of
 11 it. I have no idea how that could have
 12 ever possibly happened. And, again, I'm
 13 not trying to cover up this. And this
 14 is exactly why citations are so
 15 important and why it's, like, a massive
 16 issue. And why, when you first talked
 17 to me about this was I'm trying to
 18 figure out -- like, I can't explain
 19 this.

20 So the question was -- so that's
 21 why I literally asked you, does there
 22 have to be some sort of mens rea
 23 regarding plagiarism or is there any
 24 room for a simple mistake. Like a
 25 simple, complete unknowingly,

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

Page 166

Page 167

1 Proceedings
2 unintentional mistake where I read so
3 many papers on public access pertaining
4 to trade secrets and based on this issue
5 that I literally thought that this was a
6 paragraph in my outline that I read
7 myself and somehow misplaced the
8 citation that was right after it
9 because, obviously, I would have never
10 even never included it.

11 And again, the biggest thing is I
12 had this entire paper included in my
13 outline, so there was never any attempt
14 to conceal that. And I knew full
15 well -- well, I, actually, in my mind, I
16 knew full well that Professor Gould knew
17 of this paper because in my mind, he saw
18 it during my outline. And so I didn't
19 even think that it was going to be like
20 a Google kind of search or whatever.

21 PROFESSOR RIESMEYER: Dean
22 Williams, I have a question about the
23 Turnitin. The last page, it says 59%
24 similarity index. Does that mean 59% of
25 Ms. Tshudy's paper is the same as the

1 Proceedings
2 law review article?
3 MS. TSHUDY: Yes.
4 PROFESSOR RIESMEYER: Okay. And
5 do you know what the other percentages
6 are? 57, 56 and 10, what they mean?

7 DEAN WILLIAMS: Actually, let me
8 look at that again.

9 PROFESSOR BUTLER: While you're
10 looking at that -- Ms. Tshudy, because I
11 understand that you're telling us,
12 initially, that you did not read the law
13 note except for possibly for some of the
14 footnotes. Now, you're telling us that
15 it's possibly part of your outline,
16 which means you must have read it
17 because you put the paragraph into your
18 outline.

19 MS. TSHUDY: Well, no, I never
20 read it through, especially the analysis
21 and everything. So I don't know if this
22 was just somehow brought over because I
23 was trying to -- because I read so many.

24 PROFESSOR BUTLER: If it was
25 brought over, was it by cut and paste?

Page 168

Page 169

1 Proceedings
2 MS. TSHUDY: Not into my paper,
3 no. But into my second outline that was
4 separate from the first one that I
5 presented to him, where I was trying
6 to -- where I would take, you know,
7 ideas that I felt were, sort of,
8 important or kind of what I was also
9 grasping. And especially for this,
10 there were so many different people,
11 including this, in different words,
12 that -- ideally, I would take those and
13 try to make sure that I didn't do a
14 single one of them and kind of create my
15 own that avoided copying over other
16 people's.

17 And this is the exact opposite of
18 what the intention of that is,
19 because -- there are so many paragraphs
20 that I read that are almost exactly the
21 same as this.

22 PROFESSOR BUTLER: None of them
23 are saved. Not one of them.

24 MS. TSHUDY: Okay. Yeah. I think
25 the biggest thing is understanding

1 Proceedings
2 what -- I normally choose very unique
3 topics because I don't want to have to
4 dance around sources and stuff. So I've
5 never had to really deal with
6 understanding what is considered a
7 generalization -- and this is just
8 something that I suppose -- to me, I
9 believe was a generalization that I had
10 made just because so many different
11 people had made those same conclusions.
12 They're nonspecific draws.

13 So it was just something that I
14 messed up from my own work, but
15 completely unintentional. And like I
16 said, I had mentioned this. As soon as
17 she mentioned that this was something
18 that had happened, that obviously it
19 must be a mistake and that there was
20 never any intention to steal anything
21 from this note, if that makes sense.

22 PROFESSOR BUTLER: Dean Williams,
23 do you have a response?

24 DEAN WILLIAMS: I do have a
25 response to Professor Riesmeyer. So,

43 (Pages 166 to 169)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 Proceedings</p> <p>2 I'm sorry, I misspoke. The 59%</p> <p>3 similarity index is versus every source,</p> <p>4 but then if you look at the</p> <p>5 digitalcommons.law.uga underneath that</p> <p>6 and it says 49. 49% of this paper is an</p> <p>7 exact match of the law review notes.</p> <p>8 PROFESSOR BUTLER: Professor</p> <p>9 Gould.</p> <p>10 PROFESSOR GOULD: It's okay. I'll</p> <p>11 wait.</p> <p>12 DEAN WILLIAMS: No, go ahead.</p> <p>13 PROFESSOR GOULD: There are a few</p> <p>14 things I really have to respond to. I</p> <p>15 can do it later, too.</p> <p>16 PROFESSOR BUTLER: It's a good</p> <p>17 time now. Go ahead.</p> <p>18 PROFESSOR GOULD: All right. Just</p> <p>19 a couple of things. Just to correct the</p> <p>20 record.</p> <p>21 If I heard it right, Ms. Tshudy,</p> <p>22 at one point seemed to indicate some</p> <p>23 disappointment. She thought that after</p> <p>24 reading just the first few sentences of</p> <p>25 her paper, I ran and did a Google</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 Proceedings</p> <p>2 search, but I hope it's clear that I was</p> <p>3 very familiar with Ms. Tshudy's paper at</p> <p>4 the time. And then when I found the</p> <p>5 Rogers' note, it was in the Rogers'</p> <p>6 note, the first thing I noticed was the</p> <p>7 first couple of sentences. So I don't</p> <p>8 want to make it seem like I jumped to</p> <p>9 some Google search after hearing just</p> <p>10 two lines. That's way it sounded, so I</p> <p>11 need to correct that.</p> <p>12 On this outline that I now see has</p> <p>13 mention of the Momenta case, just to be</p> <p>14 clear -- I think maybe Dean Rogers found</p> <p>15 that the outline that was sent had like,</p> <p>16 70 plus pages. The outlines students</p> <p>17 were supposed to send would be like two</p> <p>18 to three pages. And that's what</p> <p>19 everyone's done this term and, you know,</p> <p>20 previous term.</p> <p>21 So Ms. Tshudy, the outline she</p> <p>22 sent me, in like October, had two or</p> <p>23 three pages of outline, but then had 70</p> <p>24 plus pages of just sort of random</p> <p>25 material -- I'll just call it material.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 Proceedings</p> <p>2 I think it's probably cut-and-paste, but</p> <p>3 I'll just -- material. And I do not</p> <p>4 recall seeing that case at the bottom,</p> <p>5 near the bottom of the 70 pages. I just</p> <p>6 wanted to clarify the record of that.</p> <p>7 I'm pretty confident that I did not</p> <p>8 see -- at the time, I think I saw 70</p> <p>9 plus pages. If she's sending me some</p> <p>10 collection of material, I'm not going</p> <p>11 through it all. So I was not aware of</p> <p>12 the Momenta -- sorry -- of the Rogers'</p> <p>13 article until I did that Google search</p> <p>14 in December.</p> <p>15 And just two other things, real</p> <p>16 quick. On the selection of topics, you</p> <p>17 know, these are topics that Ms. Tshudy</p> <p>18 selected for herself. The Right to Try,</p> <p>19 as I recall, right from the beginning,</p> <p>20 she selected that for her slide</p> <p>21 presentation. And then for the paper,</p> <p>22 early on, if I can remember, something</p> <p>23 about entrepreneurial aspects of</p> <p>24 biotech, something like that. And I</p> <p>25 didn't reject it. I just said, Oh, if</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 Proceedings</p> <p>2 you want to do that just -- I said</p> <p>3 something like, just make sure it</p> <p>4 doesn't look like a whole business case,</p> <p>5 you know, make sure it's a law school</p> <p>6 paper. So I did not reject it. These</p> <p>7 are topics she selected.</p> <p>8 And then last thing is this</p> <p>9 discussion how I was very interested in</p> <p>10 the litigation sector. I was also</p> <p>11 interested in the trade secret part and</p> <p>12 discussions, I remember, were mainly to</p> <p>13 do with the manufacturing process. This</p> <p>14 is a thing that's not only discussed by</p> <p>15 scholars, but real-life attorneys in our</p> <p>16 practice. This is the hot area that's</p> <p>17 still actively discussed today, trying</p> <p>18 to weigh and strategize with</p> <p>19 manufacturing processes, making the</p> <p>20 biomolecules, what to go after trade</p> <p>21 protection versus what to patent.</p> <p>22 And the reason I wanted to bring</p> <p>23 that up, first of all, the example, the</p> <p>24 paper -- or some article that Ms. Tshudy</p> <p>25 briefly put up, at least in the little</p>

44 (Pages 170 to 173)

Page 174

Page 175

1 Proceedings
 2 we saw, we just saw a couple of -- not
 3 the sample paper. The one the
 4 Ms. Tshudy -- we only saw like a couple
 5 of paragraphs, I guess.
 6 DEAN WILLIAMS: The one that
 7 Trisha put up.
 8 PROFESSOR RIESMEYER: I don't
 9 think you have --
 10 DEAN WILLIAMS: I don't have that.
 11 PROFESSOR GOULD: If you want to
 12 look at it, we can. But from the little
 13 we saw, it looks like it focuses on
 14 manufacturing processes. I know this is
 15 getting a little technical, but that was
 16 what I remember of these discussions.
 17 So another reason, having not seen the
 18 Rogers' paper until December when I did
 19 the Google search. This was interesting
 20 and new to me that someone would focus
 21 on the testing for FDA submission.
 22 And that goes to the conclusions.
 23 And we had some dialogue earlier, we
 24 were sort of parsing through, trying to
 25 see if there was something novel about

1 Proceedings
 2 Ms. Tshudy's paper and I tried to parse
 3 this and noted that she took out the
 4 word "bioequivalency" and putting in
 5 "testing methods."
 6 But now that we've gone through
 7 all this, it has, mind you, very good
 8 observations about the conclusion. In
 9 my view, that takes nothing away from my
 10 view that it's the same basic thesis.
 11 And in the conclusion, everything was
 12 said, years, right, and the focus on a
 13 viable alternative, you know, that
 14 phrase, that was interesting and I had
 15 not seen before.
 16 So I just wanted to clear the
 17 record on that.
 18 PROFESSOR BUTLER: Thank you.
 19 DEAN WILLIAMS: I have a few
 20 additional questions, but [REDACTED], go
 21 ahead.
 22 [REDACTED]: Okay. I was seeing
 23 some questions, and it's -- just to
 24 clarify, am I able to ask anybody at
 25 this point? Or is it just --

Page 176

Page 177

1 Proceedings
 2 DEAN WILLIAMS: You can ask
 3 anybody, go ahead.
 4 [REDACTED]: Okay. So just
 5 clarification. And it might seem like
 6 little random things on the side, but --
 7 so you mentioned that you received an
 8 email and you were given how many hours
 9 to respond?
 10 MS. TSHUDY: Okay. I'll check
 11 that right now.
 12 [REDACTED]: I believe you said at
 13 5:00 or by 5:00 that day, but how long
 14 was that?
 15 MS. TSHUDY: Let me check on that.
 16 DEAN WILLIAMS: I can help you
 17 with that, [REDACTED].
 18 MS. TSHUDY: Sorry, am I taking
 19 too long?
 20 [REDACTED]: Whoever --
 21 MS. TSHUDY: I think she talked to
 22 me --
 23 DEAN WILLIAMS: I'll send it to
 24 you.
 25 Here's the email that I sent. So

1 Proceedings
 2 I asked her what sample paper she was
 3 referring -- but I sent her an email on
 4 Tuesday, January 4, at 12:02 p.m. So at
 5 noon -- I'm sorry, this is the wrong
 6 one. This is her note to me on Tuesday
 7 at 12:00. I sent a note back to her on
 8 Tuesday afternoon -- sorry. So 9:00 in
 9 the morning on the 5th -- I forwarded it
 10 at 9:00 in the morning. But when did I
 11 write it?
 12 PROFESSOR GOULD: It looks like
 13 Tuesday evening, there in the corner.
 14 PROFESSOR RIESMEYER: Tuesday at
 15 five.
 16 DEAN WILLIAMS: Okay. Tuesday
 17 at -- yeah, Tuesday at 5:00 -- 5:06.
 18 So, Tuesday afternoon at 5:00.
 19 And I asked for a response by Wednesday
 20 at 5:00.
 21 [REDACTED]: And is that the
 22 typical amount of time students are
 23 given to respond?
 24 DEAN WILLIAMS: Yeah, I mean, I
 25 think -- I gave her all of this

45 (Pages 174 to 177)

Page 178

1 Proceedings
 2 information with including, you know,
 3 the papers. These are the
 4 pink-highlighted papers showing the
 5 similarities --
 6 [REDACTED]: And that was after an
 7 agreement was attempted to be reached?
 8 DEAN WILLIAMS: That was -- she
 9 and I had a conversation -- so we had a
 10 conversation on the 3rd, and then we had
 11 further -- I asked for that additional
 12 information. I sent this to Trisha on
 13 the 4th at 5:00, asked for a response by
 14 the 5th at 5:00, and then with an
 15 explanation of the process.
 16 [REDACTED]: Ms. Tshudy, what would
 17 have been the outcome of the agreement
 18 if you had decided to agree with what
 19 had been asked? So there was an
 20 agreement that was attempted to be made
 21 before, but you did not want to agree to
 22 it because it would have required you to
 23 admit to everything explicitly? I
 24 guess, what would the outcome have been?
 25 Like, what would have been the sanction

Page 179

1 Proceedings
 2 or the consequence?
 3 MS. TSHUDY: I assume that it
 4 would, likely, be up to Dean Williams.
 5 I just wanted the chance to, at
 6 least, show all the precautions that I
 7 did and, at least, explain my story that
 8 in my mind -- obviously, I've written
 9 many papers before, never had any of
 10 this happened, was blindsided by this
 11 and wanted to understand how this
 12 possibly could have come. But it was
 13 hard not getting that chance.
 14 And trying to explain in such a
 15 short amount of time because,
 16 obviously -- I think you probably could
 17 have seen that -- we sent emails back
 18 and forth with one another where I was
 19 trying to send her all this info to kind
 20 of get my story out.
 21 And I told her, when it had to
 22 come to this, I was literally like, if I
 23 could avoid this I would and I'm sorry
 24 that I can't explain it, in short -- I
 25 can't explain it short enough, that I

Page 180

1 Proceedings
 2 really would like just the ability to
 3 expound on it because a significant
 4 amount of what is shown as copying is
 5 literally citations and stuff from other
 6 cases -- other stuff that I cited to.
 7 It's actually interesting if you would
 8 eliminate from my paper stuff that is
 9 directly taken that is cited too
 10 properly from the primary source and
 11 stuff, I think it would show much
 12 different picture.
 13 But again it was just so quick
 14 that I couldn't. So I had no idea
 15 because I've never experienced this
 16 process before, I had no idea what to
 17 expect. She was very -- kind enough to
 18 send me, you know, everything that
 19 addresses plagiarism and stuff and,
 20 like, I talked to her and explained that
 21 I am no way over-assuming my ability
 22 this semester. And I could honestly see
 23 myself making mistakes just from how it
 24 was I tried to prevent those mistakes.
 25 And so I'm not going to deny that that

Page 181

1 Proceedings
 2 happened.
 3 What caught me was that -- I
 4 literally looked up the plagiarism
 5 definition and it was "intentionally"
 6 and "knowingly." And from what I saw in
 7 the paper, things -- other than that one
 8 paragraph that I couldn't explain to her
 9 and I admitted I couldn't --
 10 literally -- have no idea -- other than
 11 that one paragraph, most of it is just
 12 because we're talking about the same
 13 thing with, you know, the same cases,
 14 but if you look at what's usable in
 15 those cases it would be the same
 16 quotation.
 17 So to me it was the hope to be
 18 able to eliminate what was obviously
 19 just generic. Like the first sentences
 20 in my paragraph, I didn't include a
 21 statistic because -- I probably should
 22 have, if I had time. But it was just so
 23 used in so many papers, like everything
 24 there. Like, I didn't use anything
 25 specific or anything like that because

46 (Pages 178 to 181)